

TRULINCS 54001048 - BRENNERMAN, RAHEEM J - Unit: BRO-I-B

FROM: 54001048
TO:
SUBJECT: Re: LEGAL CORRESPONDENCE-07.16.18
DATE: 07/16/2018 01:46:45 PM

x

Raheem J. Brennerman (54001-048)
Metropolitan Detention Center
P O Box 329002
Brooklyn, New York 11232

Honorable Judge Richard J. Sullivan
United States District Judge
United States District Court
40 Foley Square
New York, New York 10007

July 16, 2018

Re: United States v. Raheem J. Brennerman
Case No. 1:17-cr-337 (RJS)
PRE- SENTENCING REPORT (FATICO HEARING)

Dear Judge Sullivan:

Defendant Pro Se, Raheem Brennerman ("Brennerman") writes to this Court, to submit and emphasize his objections to the pre-sentencing report, which were submitted on June 27, 2018 pursuant to Rule 32(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to the Probation Department.

On June 27, 2018, Pursuant to Rule 32(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Brennerman submitted his objections through his appointed standby counsel, Attorney Scott B. Tulman to the Probation department. Then on July 11, 2018, based on the objections submitted to the probation department, the probation department did not adopt the objections submitted by Brennerman or provide any demonstrable evidence in support of the adopted guideline or enhancements contained within the report. Further, because of the perjury, a federal crime, committed by Government Prosecutors prosecuting this case, (see July 24, 2018 correspondence to the Court); (see also document numbers 59 and 82 at docket 18-1618 in the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and other relevant document numbers at dockets 18-1033 and 18-1671). Brennerman requested for a fatico hearing on material disputed facts relevant to sentencing. A true copy of the objections submitted pursuant to Rule 32(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure is appended to this correspondence as if stated within this section of the correspondence.

As advised by Attorney Scott B. Tulman on July 15, 2018, the pre-sentencing report (which Brennerman has not received or reviewed) adopts an inaccurate guideline among others, which is based on a \$20 million wire fraud loss, while all evidence in the indictment and presented by Government at trial, demonstrates that Blacksands received \$4.4 million from the alleged victim - ICBC (London) PLC. Furthermore, because Government Prosecutors have never received or reviewed the complete ICBC London lending file, nor, have they presented the complete transaction documents. They are unable to proffer the accurate information and complete documents with respect to the bridge finance, in that, only \$5 million of the \$20 million finance was approved, while the remaining \$15 million from the bridge finance was held in an account controlled by ICBC (London) PLC pursuant to an English law document - Security/Pledge over account. Moreover, ICBC (London) PLC the alleged victim, has not made any announcement, disclosure or representation, that it was a victim of fraud or that it became involved in any fraudulent transaction through its transaction with Blacksands. (See newly discovered evidence at docket no. 164, exhibit 3), and evidence demonstrating that evidence at dkt. no. 164, exhibit 3, is newly discovered at docket number 168. Additionally, because the integrity of Government Prosecutors is now an issue given the perjury, a federal crime, committed by Government Prosecutors, the need for a fatico hearing on material disputed facts relevant to sentencing is very important and necessary.

Pre-Sentencing Report are based on material facts and where objections are timely submitted as proscribed in section f of Rule 32 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Probation Department should further investigate and obtain demonstrable evidence, however such has not been done in this instance, and Brennerman submits this correspondence to bolster his arguments and request for a fatico hearing, in light of the issues highlighted above, which is among others.

Brennerman respectfully submits the above and awaits the Courts response.

Dated: July 16, 2018
New York City, New York

TRULINCS 54001048 - BRENNERMAN, RAHEEM J - Unit: BRO-I-B

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

/s/ Raheem J. Brennerman
Defendant Pro Se